

The Gospel Messenger,

AND

SOUTHERN EPISCOPAL REGISTER.

VOL. VII.

JUNE, 1830.

NO. 78.

The value of this article, fully entitles it to the large space which it occupies in our pages.

Review of "Aids to Reflection," by S. T. COLERIDGE, with a Preliminary Essay. Notes and Illustrations, by James Marsh. Burlington. 1829.

(Continued from page 139.)

THE distinction for which the author so strongly contends, between the understanding and reason, deserves close and dispassionate examination. It is not a mere dispute about words—a distinction without difference—but it is one which if established, involves consequences of no ordinary magnitude. Whatever will tend to widen and deepen the lines of demarcation, or rather to interpose an impassable gulf between the popular systems of belief and philosophy, and the absurd and brutal tenets of Materialism, has certainly a strong claim upon our attention. Such is the tendency of the theory in question. It contends for a *distinction in kind*, and not merely *in degree*, between man and the brute. Depress the one and elevate the other as you will, still they can never be placed upon a level. It is at once amusing and provoking, to note the infinite pains, and wonderful satisfaction which philosophers of the material school have taken, in magnifying the acuteness and ingenuity of Pug, and Tray, and Bucephalus. To their own perfect conviction and high delight, they have proved these gifted animals to be legitimately, brethren of the same great family; with quite as much of soul, and as fair a title to immortality as man; only born and nurtured under some disadvantages, *younger brethren*, not quite so richly portioned—but still with kindred blood in their veins—and with the same brains in their heads—having the same general capacities—and, therefore, *ex necessitate rei* destined to share his future and exalted existence, or to have him come down and share their eternal sleep in the equal grave. Leaving these liberal and enlightened reasoners to enlarge the circle of animal affinity or relationship at will, and to give "the right hand of fellowship" to creatures that have not a hand to give in return, and which we fear have scarcely discernment or gratitude enough to thank them for the flattering concessions, we prefer the sound and sober views of our author, which place a direct and insuperable bar

to all such unnatural equalization—such monstrous and unscientific classifications. We find a higher faculty than understanding, which man has and which they have not. There is reason—"the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"—but which sheddeth not a ray upon them. This "image of God"—this peculiar gift, decides our supremacy in the scale of being. It enables us to conjecture, and more than to conjecture, an ultimate difference of designation—to form to ourselves a probable reason, why "the spirit of man goeth upward—and the spirit of the *beast* goeth downward to the earth." (Eccles. iii. 21.) While fully according with the *general* views of the author, there is one particular, however, in regard to which we should wholly dissent from him, viz.—in classing the *instincts*, or *instinctive intelligences* of the brute creation with the *understandings of men*. That they have something analogous to understanding, is freely admitted—but this is not *instinct*, for a larger share of *instinct*, (properly so called) so far from raising them in the scale of being, and causing them to approximate nearer to us, would, in fact, depress them, since it is clearly ascertained that *instinct is invariably most remarkable and most perfect in the very lowest forms of existence, where there is the very least of intelligence*: being in truth, not the index of *mental acuteness*, but the *substitute for it*. It may exist where there is *no trace* of understanding or volition: or again, it may co-exist with these, as it does in many animals and in man. And so far from acknowledging that "instinct, in a rational, responsible and self-conscious animal is understanding"—it is contended that in *such* an animal, instinct stands clearly and widely distinguished from understanding—being the mere animal law of his existence, while understanding is of an higher order—considers, controls and regulates this animal principle—and is more closely analogous to reason. In regard to instinct, we are disposed to unite in the view which the able and lamented Good has taken, as being of all others with which we have met, the least open to objections, and the most conformable with facts. He describes instinct to be "the operation of the living principle, whenever manifestly directing its operations to the health, preservation, or reproduction of a living frame, or of any part of such frame. It applies equally to plants and to animals—and to every part of the plant, as well as to every part of the animal, so long as such part continue alive. It is hence the strawberry travels from spot to spot, and the Cod or the Cuckoo, with a wider range from shore to shore, or from climate to climate."^{*}

Now that plants have their *instincts* is scarcely to be doubted. These instincts are *invariable* in the *same species*, under the *same circumstances*, but *variable* when circumstances *vary*. Beyond all question, they have an *adaptive* or accommodative power, by virtue of which they conform to the change of soil, of climate, of position, &c. But none surely would term this *understanding*, although it exactly identifies itself with what the author considers

* Book of Nature, vol. i. pp. 83-85.

the highest degree of this principle of instinct, viz. "the power of selecting and adapting the proper means to the proximate ends, according to varying circumstances." It is the *law* of the Creator, originally impressed upon the *species*—obedience to it, is mere obedience to *impulse*. But, over and above all this, and apart from all tendencies, powers and acts connected with the preservation or reproduction of the species, it is certain that many animals have *understanding*, that is, according to our author's definition, *a faculty which judges according to sense*. To this faculty are to be ascribed all those powers or acts to which we give the name of sagacity—which certainly involve association and comparison of ideas, which grow out of circumstances and emergencies—powers which are capable of increase or diminution, and which vary not only in different species, but in *different individuals* of the *same species*, and in the same individual at different times. These we clearly distinguish from instinct, and may term the *brutal understanding*. But this is the highest point of *their intelligence*. Man to a similar, but more perfect faculty, the understanding—joins reason; the faculty which is *not* tied down to the *judgment by sense*, but which forms, considers and applies abstract principle to abstract truth—the spiritual faculty which contemplates spiritual things—which can even look up to Him "*who is a Spirit*"—which overlooks and often reverses the judgments of sense—and which wholly independent of them—has a sphere and a world of *its own*.

With the metaphysical principles of the work, we are decidedly pleased. Their peculiarities and tendency, will be best learned from the work itself, and from the lucid exposition of them given by the editor. In a work, bearing the modest title of "*Aids to Reflection*," it would be unreasonable to expect a complete and digested *system* of metaphysics. There are, however, hints thrown out which deserve careful treasuring up. There is the basis of a nobler superstructure—the germ of a fairer tree of knowledge—in the prominent and well-defended sentiment, of an inherent power in the will to judge of the representations of the senses, and to yield to, or resist inward promptings and external influences!

Scarcely compatible with this freewill style of metaphysics, is the slight Calvinistic tinge which pervades the work. It is, however, so slight as scarcely to offend the eye, or to occasion alarm to the most strenuous Arminian. It sits upon our author so easily and gracefully, and it leaves so completely exposed to view the "fine gold" of a bright intellect and a pure heart, that we could scarcely insist upon its being laid aside. As held by him, it has so much of the manly sense and exalted piety of his favorite Leighton, that we almost lose the disposition to object, in the much which we see to admire. Indeed, the election which he professedly holds, is so modified, so unpresuming, and so guarded, that it certainly must be entirely too dilute for the palates that have been accustomed to the strong draughts of unmixed Calvinism. The doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation finds no place—but is expressly condemned. In p. 105, we find this strong language—

"But *Aids* observe! therefore *not* by the will of man alone, but neither *without* the will. The doctrine of modern Calvinism, as laid down by Jonathan Edwards and the late Dr. Williams, which represents a will absolutely passive. Clay in the hands of a potter, destroys all will; takes away its essence and definition as effectually as in saying—this circle is square—I should deny the figure to be a *circle* at all. It was in strict consistency, therefore, that these writers supported the necessitarian scheme, &c. &c. With such a system, not the wit of man, nor all the Theodices ever framed by human ingenuity, before and since the attempt of the celebrated Leibnitz, can reconcile the sense of responsibility, nor the fact of the difference *in kind*, between regret and remorse. The same compulsion of consequence, drove the fathers of modern, (or Pseudo Calvinism) to the origination of holiness in power, of justice, in right of property, and whatever outrages on the common sense and moral feelings of mankind, they have sought to cover under the fair name of *sovereign grace*."

Still, while he gives up *the thing*, he contends for *the name*. Condemning wholly what is commonly understood by "the doctrine of election"—he still contends for another "doctrine of election"—to which he ascribes nothing arbitrary, but which if it be *election at all*, and if it be demonstrable by the mode of proof he has used, cannot be *particular election*, or if such, must be arbitrary. His summary mode of proof is this—"Thus then, the doctrine of election, is in itself a necessary inference from an undeniable fact; necessary at least, for all who hold that the best of men are what they are, through the grace of God." This hasty conclusion from the simple fact of a moral or spiritual difference between men, is certainly a strange *non sequitur* for a logical man. Admit fully that it was *God* who made the righteous "to differ from others"—that they have nothing which they have not "received"—and that, consequently they must not "boast"—still, according to the Scriptures and according to the author's whole *hypothesis*, God did this gently, through the *concurrence of their will*; and he was willing to have done the very same, and strove to do the very same for the ungodly, but "they would not." The only "election" then, which this would establish, would be *that general election* which none will gainsay, of those who freely receive the freely offered salvation of the gospel, on gospel terms—who daily improve the assistances of grace—the *power to do so being of God*; but the same power being supposed given to the reprobate, to the full vindication of God, but rejected by them to their own condemnation. The *inference* then on which the author lays so much stress, and by which he deems the knotty point settled forever, entirely fails of its effect; since, although all good men must say, "By the grace of God, I am what I am," no bad or unholy man can say, *through the want of grace*, "I am what I am."

But as though afraid even of his own modified view of election, the author proceeds to say, p. 114—"But though I hold the doctrine, handled as Leighton handled it, (that is practically, morally,

humanly) rational, safe, and of essential importance, I see many reasons resulting from the peculiar circumstances under which St. Paul preached and wrote, why a discreet minister of the gospel should avoid the frequent use of the *term*, and express the *meaning*, in other words perfectly equivalent, and equally scriptural: lest in *saying* truth he convey error." Now against this, we loudly protest. If election be a gospel doctrine, let it be preached, not *covertly*, but *under its own name, fully, fairly, openly*. We have not, thanks to the God of truth, one system and one set of terms for the lettered sage, the matured Christian, and another for the ignorant vulgar. The obligatory law upon all who proclaim the gospel, is "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth"—"the whole counsel of God:" and that which cannot *be preached in its own name without danger*, can scarcely be scriptural, of God! If there is danger even in *terms*, it is high time to inquire whether there is perfect correctness and safety in the *doctrines* to which they have been appropriated. And here let it be remarked, that the fears perpetually expressed by the holders of Calvinistic tenets, lest mischief should ensue from their promulgation—the whispered caution of the old and experienced, to the young and ardent—the general abstraction of the truth from the popular eye, and hiding it as it were in a corner—the mere speculative retention of a dogma which is handled and given out, and administered as delicately, as carefully as though it were a deadly poison, of which the smallest over-portion would prove fatal—these, be assured, speak more against the doctrine, than all the tongues of all the opponents by which it has ever been assailed. Where so much fear and mistrust prevail in the defenders, there cannot but be *weakness in the works*. Had the tenet a tongue, well might it say—"Save me from my friends, and I will take care of my enemies!" God defend the Church, her ministers and her members from all doctrines and practices that shun the light of day—that must be discussed with closed doors—that must be held and taught with mental reservations—whispered in the ear—disguised under feigned or new names! "We have not so learned Christ."

On the subject of *Original Sin*, the author enters at large but by no means to our satisfaction. We cannot follow him through all his remarks. He complains much of the severity with which Bishop Taylor handled "the doctrine of Ultra-Calvinism," which prevailed during "the quinquarticular fever." * If there was "a distorted doctrine of Ultra-Calvinism" prevailing on the subject, was it not right and proper that the Bishop should expose its true nature? If "a quinquarticular fever" prevailed, was it not his duty to administer the bitter, unpalatable, but wholesome medicine of strong argument and rebuke? Surely in this case he cannot be accused of "fighting uncertainty"—of "beating the air." We have not before us the Tract of Bishop Taylor, to which reference is particularly made. The illustration drawn from David's choice of the children of Michael to be given up to death, like most other human and fanciful illustrations of difficult subjects in theology,

was unhappy. But from many other parts of his writings, we should be induced to infer general correctness on this point. The principal ground of complaint with our author is, that the Bishop's scheme represents "the descendants of Adam as despoiled, or left destitute of all those aids and graces (which he enjoyed) while the obligation to perfect obedience was continued;" that "they were subjected to a law, the fulfilment of which was all but impossible, yet the penalty on the failure tremendous." We have searched in vain for this obnoxious idea, and we strongly suspect some misapprehension of the Bishop's view. He does indeed declare in one place, "that the fall of Adam lost to him all those supernatural assistances which God put into our nature by way of grace," (*Life of Christ*, Part I. Sec. 5.) but he in another place explains the meaning, and vindicates it from the inference charged upon him. (We quote from the 2d Part, 9th Section of the same work, p. 131, folio edit.) "And in short, the case is this:—Original righteousness was in Adam after the manner of nature; but it was an act or effect of grace, and by it men were not made, but *born* righteous. Now because *this*, if Adam had stood, should have been born with every child, there was in infants a principle, which was the seed of holy life here, and a blessed life hereafter, &c. Now *what was lost by Adam is restored by Christ*—the same righteousness, only it is not born, but *superinduced, not integral but interrupted*: but *such as it is, there is no difference, but that the same or the like principle may be derived to us from Christ, as there should have been from Adam, that is a principle of obedience, a regularity of faculties, a beauty in the soul and a state of acceptation with God;*" and farther, "if therefore, nature hath in infants an evil principle which operates when the child can chuse, but is all the while in the soul; either *infants have by grace a principle put into them, or else sin abounds, where grace does not superabound, expressly against the doctrine of the Apostle.*" Either then, the Bishop is strangely inconsistent with himself, or he is innocent of the strange perversion of truth laid to his charge, for he himself *indignantly disavows it*, and asserts the opposite with more clearness and force than our author himself. We see readily enough how the author's mistake originated. He laid hold upon Bishop Taylor's supposition of the *withdrawal of the primeval grace or assistance given to Adam*, but he either did not notice, or forgot to state his clear recognition of *the grace and assistance of the spirit given through Christ*. Half the Bishop's theory, viewed by itself, lays him open to censure: *the whole taken together, relieves him from all embarrassment*, and represents him as "speaking the words of truth and soberness."

But what is our author's scheme? Will that stand the test of close and critical examination? He defines original sin to be a *sin originating in a human will; without this origin he declares, that "it may be calamity, deformity, disease or mischief, but sin it cannot be."* Now what does this refinement upon terms amount to? Is this depravity of the will universal, or partial? Is it the necessary attendant of our birth, or not? If these questions be answered

affirmatively, then surely it is *our misfortune!* But if the author intends that it is *originant* in the *individual will*, and that the individual will must have acted upon it, must have the power of acquiescence with, or rejection of, it—then surely to be consistent, he must deny its presence until such time as *the will is sufficiently developed to act—that is in all infants*—and when it is *thus developed*, and does act, either it must act under *necessity of acquiescence*, or else *some would surely not acquiesce* and so this original sin *would not be universal* in those who did acquiesce, and would not the acquiescence of the individual will, constitute *actual*, not *original sin*. This is a dilemma from which we see no escape. If the pravity of the will be universal, inherited, then it is a misfortune, a disease, as well as sin. If the individual will must first act and approve, then there is *adirect* confounding of *original with actual sin*? How much more lucid, comprehensible and correct, is the article of the Church of England on the subject—that “it is the fault or corruption of our nature whereby we are very far gone from original righteousness.” Not our own personal fault, but the fault or corruption of our nature—yet our misfortune, since it might, if unchanged, exclude us from God. To this we see analogous cases in the world. Diseases and disabilities are transmitted. Suppose a child, through parental or ancestral crime, to derive a diseased state or condition of body, amounting to very loathsomeness. This would be its misfortune—but it would also exclude it from the presence and tender charities of the pure and uncontaminated. Precisely such is our state. Born in sin and corruption, we are offensive in the sight of God; and but for the atoning and cleansing system of the gospel must have been forever excluded from his presence in heaven. Since into heaven “entereth nothing that is unholy or unclean.”

The true view of the subject, is that which regards original sin as a *fact* well substantiated—demanding regret and humiliation, purification by gospel means—but not involving the *personal* guilt of *actual* commission. None of us are required to admit the monstrous doctrine, that the sin of Adam is *our own* personal sin; for against *this* the Scripture lifts up its voice. (Ezek. ch. xviii. ver. 20.) “The *soul* that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.”

On the subject of *Infant Baptism*, our author has strangely committed himself. If his Baptist friend consented to the baptism of his child, he must have been swayed by the *partiality of friendship*, rather than by the force of argument. Won by liberal and unexpected concessions, he must have surrendered his own *views as to the mere act*, as a meet return for such extraordinary candour. The author of the “*Aids*” has, in fact, abandoned all the usual and strong positions, with a frank confession “that they are evidently commanded by the strong-holds of the antagonists, and has then retired into the weak and untenable defences of *moral beauty*, ex-

pediency, and *collateral influences*. He is pleased wittily to confess, p. 220, that he has "no eye for these smoke-like wreaths of inference—this ever-widening spiral *ergo*, from the narrow aperture of perhaps a single text—that he starts back from these inverted pyramids, where the apex is the base!" With all imaginable and due deference, we would however ask, whether the fault may not be in his own vision? Whether he may not in this instance be somewhat short-sighted? Philosophers tell us that all objects come to the retina, *inverted*—that habit enables us to change and straighten them. May he not have forgotten to reverse the image of this unfortunate cone, on the mental eye? Ought he not to have remembered, that very many clear-sighted and long-headed men have pronounced this foundation, in his view so point-like, *broad* and *strong*—and these inferences, to him so "smoke-like," legitimate, obvious and convincing? He could scarcely have struck upon a more unfortunate illustration of what he deems unfair deduction, than the supposed case of the Theatre. The argument is this—that should we say "we had called at a friend's house and found nobody at home, the family having all gone to the Play"—the words *nobody* and *all* could not warrant the inference, that an infant six months old had been taken to the Theatre—and *consequently*, that the expression "he and all his household were baptized," would not warrant the inference that the children were also baptized. Now the cases are by no means parallel. In the first case, he admits that it was not customary, and "that it might be known, that infants of that age would not be admitted into the Theatre." In the other case, he admits that "had baptism of infants at that early period of the gospel, been a known practice, or had this been previously demonstrated—then, indeed, the argument would have been no otherwise objectionable than as being superfluous," &c. Now this is the very state of the matter. The gospel history is silent as to the gospel practice. But it was the invariable *Jewish custom*, in the case of proselytes, to *baptize children with the parents*. On the faith of the parents, the whole household at the time were baptized, including all male children under thirteen years and a day, and all female children under twelve years and a day. (*Vide Wall on Inf. Baptism, &c.*) Now as the Saviour did not institute a new ordinance, but simply transferred a rite customary in all cases of proselytism, long known and revered, and recently used by the Holy Baptist, to his own gospel, as the mode of initiation—he must have intended the current existing custom to be continued, except there be a specification to the contrary. That existing custom was, to baptize *children* as well as *adults*. When he then gave the unlimited command "go ye into all nations teaching (or making disciples of) them, and baptizing them," it must have included, according to universal custom, infants as well as adults. Instead of asking, where is the *warrant for their baptism, expressly by name?* we must ask, where is the *prohibition?* If he does not reverse the general practice, *it remains in full force*, and constitutes their title. Where is that reversal? Let it be produced, and we yield.

Yes, but he says "repentance and faith are (in Scripture) the *terms* and indispensable conditions of baptism!" *Truly so*—to those who were capable of their performance, but to none others. Repentance and *faith* are also made indispensable to salvation. Infants cannot repent and believe. Are they, therefore cut off from salvation? Of such (said the Saviour) is the kingdom of heaven!

We come now to a point which we would fain pass over—to a theory unworthy of the subject, unworthy of the author—*painful to the Christian mind*. In p. 224, we find this startling language—"This (viz. its being a Scripture ordinance) is a very sufficient reason for the continued observance of a *ceremonial rite* so derived and sanctioned, even though its own beauty, simplicity and natural significancy had pleaded less strongly in its behalf! But it is no reason why the Church should forget, that the perpetuation of a thing does *not alter the nature of a thing*, and that a *ceremony to be perpetuated*, is to be perpetuated *as a ceremony*." So then, the sacrament of baptism, instituted by Christ himself, and pronounced by him generally necessary to salvation, is discovered to be a *mere ceremony—a ceremonial rite*! And because even this ceremony was too highly regarded—superstitiously venerated—he supposes the Church "to have piously and rightfully adopted the measures best calculated to check the tendency, and correct the abuse! And what were these measures? The author tells us, p. 226, "What can be conceived better calculated to prevent the ceremony from being regarded as other and more than a ceremony, if not the administration of the same to an object, (yea, a dear and precious object) of spiritual duties, but a subject of spiritual operations and graces, only *by anticipation*—a subject unconscious as the flower of the dew falling on it, or the early rain," &c. that is, in plain parlance, that the Church, contrary to divine institution and primitive usage, in "the exercise of a sound discretion," administered the ordinance to infants, in order *to degrade it in popular estimation*! This is, indeed, a novel and daring hypothesis! We have heard its introduction ascribed to the overweening estimate of its importance—but never before to the pious and rightful (might we not say impious and unlawful—for would there not be impiety and unlawfulness in changing the ordinances of her Divine Head?) the pious and rightful effort of the Church to reduce or correct this estimate. In support of such a theory, well might we ask our author for proofs—for dates—for names! When—in what year—in what council—the Church enacted this change, but it would be in vain. *None can be produced*. Like the asserted but unproved, and almost impossible supposition of a silent change of the *practice*, so this *volunteered reason* for the change has no vouchers; and we turn from the forward hazarding of such conjecture, with a feeling bordering on disgust.

The author of "the Aids," offers a few remarks on the kindred subject of *Baptismal Regeneration*. They shall be dismissed in few words. It is evident they were written *under prejudice*, and *under misapprehension*. Their tone indicates the first—their substance the

latter. They are all based upon the popular misconception which confounds *regeneration* with a *change* of the *heart and the affections*—with “the renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Now, these are two distinct things, and they who most sincerely believe in *baptismal regeneration*, (as the compilers of our baptismal services for example) most earnestly pray for that *subsequent and daily renewal of the Holy Ghost*, which is popularly, but unscripturally termed *regeneration*. The author quotes language, p. 204, which Bishop Taylor used in regard to *extreme unction*, to prove that he must needs have opposed this doctrine of baptismal regeneration. There is always hazard in applying what was said in reference to one subject, to another subject widely different. Admitting, however, the applicability in this case—it would only prove that in his view, the *affections were not spiritually changed in baptism*, but by no means, *that no spiritual grace was conferred*, or that the infant recipient was not *born again out of the world into the Church*—born again to a state of covenant relation and favour. We shall adduce the Bishop's own words, (used not in reference to another, but to this same subject) to prove that this was indeed his opinion. “The next great effect of baptism which children can have, is the spirit of sanctification.”—“The event of this discourse is, that if infants be capable of the spirit of grace, there is no reason but that they may and ought to be baptized; and *that infants are made capable of the spirit of grace*, is, I think, *made very credible*.”—“The spirit of grace, the principle of Christian life, may be infused, and yet lie without action till in its own day it is drawn forth.”* “Thirdly—*In baptism we are born again*: and this *infants need* in the present circumstances, and for the same reason that men of age and reason do.” “The *second birth* spoken of in Scripture is *baptism*. A man must be born again of water and the spirit. And, therefore, baptism is *λειτουργία παλιγγενεσίας*, *the laver of a new birth*.”† Such were the sentiments of *Bishop Jeremy Taylor*, whom our author elsewhere terms “that great and shining light of our Church, in the era of her intellectual splendour”—“our Christian Mercury!” He was surely a thorough believer in *baptismal regeneration*, and must unquestionably be classed with “Drs. D'Oyly and Mant,” and the “Grotian Divines” and many “Dignitaries of the Church,” for whose sentiments the author apparently entertains so little reverence! We trust his charity for the latter will increase when he finds them in such good company, and that he will rigidly adhere to the maxim he has laid down, p. 207, “that which was perfectly safe and orthodox in 1657, in the judgment of a devoted Royalist and Episcopalian, must be at most, but a venial heterodoxy in 1825,” or 1830.

Before taking leave of an author, whose occasionally erroneous views excite a great regret proportioned to our respect for his powers, we gladly pay the tribute of unqualified admiration, to the deep, rich, and glowing views which he has presented of many of

* Taylor's *Life of Christ*, fol. pp. 130, 131.

† Same book, p. 128.

the peculiar doctrines of the gospel. With these, all who love the truth, will be charmed. They have a spirit, an unction, a power, not to be resisted. Independently of name or party, Christians and Churchmen of all names and parties, must yield them willing homage. They breathe of Scripture—they come warm from the heart of piety, and the heart melts under their influence. Throughout the whole work, there are occasional flashes of brilliant thought, and diction—but in some of the closing pages the brilliancy increases—the glow of feeling becomes more ardent. The eloquence of nature exposes with resistless effect, the heartlessness and hopelessness of all low, and cold and speculative creeds. Most, I had almost said all, will dissent from the partial censure of the pious and learned Magee—who, of all men, least deserved the charge of Grotianism—and who has ever proved himself a determined and uncompromising advocate of scriptural orthodoxy. In regard to the ingenious and great Dr. Paley, sentiments may vary. For ourselves, with our author, we feel unqualified “admiration for his head and his heart.” We doubt not his piety, nor his substantial orthodoxy: but we could wish that some things he had written, WERE NOT, and that in others, he had spoken more plainly. From his *Moral Philosophy*, and some other works, we rise with mortification and regret. In others, he shines forth as the man of talent and the pure-minded believer. *More we could have desired—for such a man should not have suffered the friends of truth to suspect, or the enemies of orthodoxy to claim him.* But he has still done much, and his memory shall flourish. Let those who would forget his services, or misconstrue his views, remember the sacredness of the grave—“*de mortuis nil, nisi bonum.*”

For the other promised work of our author, “The Assertion of Religion, as necessarily involving Revelation,” &c. the religious public will anxiously look. If it bears the same impress of talent and of piety, with that before us, it will not disappoint the close thinker, or the sincere Christian. Should its language be less obsolete, and its style more flowing, it will be more welcome to the man of taste. The Biblical student and the judicious Churchman will examine it with close scrutiny, knowing that its author is sometimes fanciful, and as capable of plausibly insinuating unintended error, as of powerfully defending Christian Truth. H. S.

Review of an “Address on the Duty and Expediency of adopting the Bible as a Class Book in every scheme of Education,” &c.

This address contains an inquiry why the Bible is excluded from our schools; and it recommends a change in this particular. Two reasons are given for its exclusion from Roman Catholic schools: the principle that the Laity indiscriminately ought not to use the Bible; and its having been so distorted and darkened by scholastic theology, that it lost its interest in the eyes of both Clerical and

Lay teachers, who were the founders of the schools among the Roman Catholics.

"The original absence of religion as a feature of general education," is stated as one of the reasons why *protestant* schools excluded the Bible. This opinion does not very well correspond with the remark, "the principles of the Reformation embraced the whole circle of human knowledge. Hence it followed that the system of education would be re-modelled."

A second reason for the exclusion is, "the apparent efficiency of public worship, and of catechetical instruction." Undoubtedly if the teacher thought his pupils were sufficiently instructed in the Bible *out of the school*, he would very naturally give his attention to other lessons. It does not seem indispensable that the same person who teaches languages, or mathematics, should also teach religion. If religious instruction, undoubtedly the most important part of education, be provided, the place where, and the person by whom, are not very material. But the efficiency of public worship and catechetical instruction is here said to be only "apparent." This position we are not prepared to admit. Use these means faithfully and perseveringly, and we cannot doubt that the result will be even more satisfactory than, they being omitted, religious instruction at school would be. But it may be said, why not make this auxiliary to those? This is a question which we shall consider hereafter. But at present we are not willing to concede to this new proposal any advantage from the supposition, erroneous as it appears to us, that the means of imparting religious instruction to the young now generally adopted are inefficient, or only apparently efficient. We admit they might be rendered more efficient by a still more intimate connection of secular and religious instruction than now exists. We should hail with great satisfaction such a connection. But there is only one way in which it can be effected, viz. by a concurrence in religious opinion, on the part of the teacher, and the parents of each school respectively. The third reason of the exclusion is stated to be sectarian jealousy, the want of a practical spirit of Christian liberality, the controversial character of religion, the intermixture of the children of various denominations at the same school." We should prefer fewer words, and those which did not imply any reproach. But undoubtedly difference of opinion among protestant Christians is the true reason why religious instruction is not particularly attended to in their schools. We think a conscientious parent not only may, but must be unwilling, to have his child taught religion by one who held different doctrinal views from himself. This reluctance we call principle, not sectarian jealousy, and think it implies not a love for controversy, but a sacred regard for truth. We should not be surprised to see such a parent ~~reluctant~~ in devising liberal things, willing to concede to every man the same right of thinking and acting for himself, and the very antipode of "illiberality." But if he were without this reluctance, we could not avoid suspecting that he was either utterly indifferent to Christianity, or

wanted a clear perception of the difference between truth and error, or from some defect in his moral powers, held his religious opinions with too feeble a grasp. Surely it is not supposed that "Christian liberality" requires a man to change his views of "the truth as it is in Jesus," in accommodation to the wishes of one or more of his Christian brethren. And if he is allowed to retain his own views, may he not be allowed to act in consistency with them—or is a distinction to be drawn between liberality as it exists in the mind, and as it is acted out, between a speculative and "a *practical* spirit of Christian liberality." Is there no way of escaping the charge of illiberality but by a compromise of principle?

The absence of religious instruction from the schools referred to, obviously, is attributable to parents and to no one else. As to his method of teaching, the master has discretion. But he has little or none as to the subject of his lessons. This is eminently true as it respects religious teaching. If parents wished their children to be taught religion at school, it would be done. It is because parents do not wish it, (and the reasons are because they are either not religious, or so sincerely so as to be unwilling to have their children taught error, or what they conceive to be such) that religious instruction is excluded from any school. Clergymen occupied in secular instruction, are, of course, as much subject to the parents of their scholars, as lay teachers are. I cannot conceive of a pious man, whether lay or clerical, keeping out of view the subject of religion, in any place for a great length of time, or in any company which he habitually keeps. Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth will speak. Indirect religious lessons (often the most impressive) are inseparable from the schools conducted by pious men. But direct regular religious instruction is not admissible in a school composed of children of different creeds, unless the instructor gives the parent due notice, that he may govern himself accordingly. We can see no impropriety in a clergyman, whose livelihood compels him to follow some secular employment, consenting to instruct children in the classics or mathematics, and to omit religious lessons, provided he cannot get pupils on other terms. The blame rests with them who do not furnish him more congenial employment. If it be allowable for a clergyman to engage in secular employment at all, why may he not in teaching, as well as any other?

But we pass to the second, which is the chief purpose of this Address, viz. to recommend "the adoption of the Bible as a Class Book." Now, entertaining as we do most sincerely great respect for the author, and we add great admiration of the noble tone of piety and virtue which pervades most of his publications, and the present one, in an eminent degree, we cannot but think that his proposal, if it is to be considered as a broad proposal to introduce the Bible into every school is impracticable, and indeed, objectionable. We confess we are surprised, that after having investigated the causes of its past exclusion, it did not occur to the worthy author that each of them, and especially the chief one he has men-

tioned, still exists in undiminished force. They who control our schools, be they trustees, parents, or schoolmasters, are of three classes, unbelievers, speculative believers, and sincere Christians. The first class, of course, will not consent to have the Bible. It is true the author refers to Diderot. But *exceptio probat regulam*. And the case would not have been cited, if it had not been an extraordinary one. It does not appear moreover, that even Diderot would have admitted into his school any more than a *selection* from the Bible—most probably only the moral part of the New Testament, for “he taught his daughter carefully in the New Testament, as the only code of *morals*.”

Speculative believers, that is, the class of Gallio's, who care for none of these things, would be guided by the popular voice, and unless we admit that a majority of the public are not only aware of the immeasurable importance of religious education, but convinced that the Bible itself is the most proper book to be used, as the medium of religious instruction, we cannot expect that the schools which are regulated by this class of indifferents will consent to adopt the Bible, or indeed take the trouble to listen to an argument on the subject.

The sincere Christian needs no argument to convince him of the value of the Bible. No panegyric can approach his elevated feelings on this subject. The pen of inspiration alone seems to him capable of doing it justice, and his heart responds to every word of that incomparable eulogy in the nineteenth Psalm.

The Christian firmly holds to the opinion, that “all the things which can be mentioned, are not to be compared to wisdom,” that is, religious truth. He is deeply solicitous that this pearl of great price should be possessed by his children. And day by day, from the first dawn of infant intelligence, up to the moment when he ceases to have any control over them, he will endeavour that “the daily bread” which the soul needs shall be given to them in full measure, pressed down, and running over. His child is taught at home and at Church in the knowledge unto salvation. And he would wish him taught also at school, formally and informally, by direct lessons, and by those incidental remarks which a pious preceptor will often make, and which such an one will very naturally incorporate even with those lessons which do not naturally invite them, and from which our author seems to suppose they must *ex neessitate rei* be separated.

But the schools over which sincere Christians have control, are comparatively few, and these few are of two kinds, the one embracing children of the same creed, and the other of different creeds. Where the children, or rather their parents are of the same creed, religious instruction will be attended to of course. Indeed, it was to effect this desirable object that such schools have been formed. There are several in our country—may their number increase more and more.

With respect to the schools differently constituted, religious instruction is attended to in some, and not in the others. We think

our author is mistaken in supposing that it is entirely excluded from our schools in general. It does not command as much time and attention as it ought, but it will be recollected that in all our Colleges and Universities, we believe we may say without exception, religion is more or less a subject of study. The same is true of many, if not most of our primary schools, and there are at least some Academies in which Butler, Paley, and the like works are studied. Such remarks then, as "the permanent exclusion of religion from schemes of general education"—"To cultivate the conscience and the affections forms no part of the scheme"—"The total separation of secular and religious education," imply too sweeping a charge.*

The use of books on the evidences rather than the doctrines of religion, and the omission of religion altogether in some schools, are to be attributed to the circumstance that the children belong to different denominations, and while this arrangement continues, our author's proposal will not be complied with. He does, indeed, intimate that they who object to Catechisms, Commentaries, Treatises, &c. could not object to the Bible. But he does not seem aware that this Bible will be only in appearance "without note or comment," for it will of course take its complection from the religious views of the teacher.

The enlightened parent will not consent to his child being initiated in principles which he believes to be unscriptural, and so he will be if his religious instructor holds such principles, *whatever be his text book*. How is it possible for one to expound the Bible, and to declare bible truths in any other way, than as he holds them. The author seems to entertain a contrary opinion, for he speaks of teaching the Scriptures so as not "to teach the peculiar views, which each sect entertain as to all others, as well as in relation to the Catholic Church," and that "the experiment has been actually and successfully tried, to a limited extent (this is an important qualification) in Sunday Schools." It is not necessary to say that we cannot admit the fact here referred to. On the contrary we consider the "American Sunday School Union," altogether a fallacy, and so it has been pronounced by that large body, the Methodists, who have formally separated from it. In this very catholic, unsectarian discourse, in the very first page of it, and abundantly elsewhere, the author has brought forward his own peculiar views of the Bible. Even on so general a topic as an eulogy of the Bible, he cannot avoid letting us discover that he believes in God manifest in the flesh, and in the doctrine of the atonement.† The teacher of course must be more particular than an address like the present, and if he is a Trinitarian, no Unitarian.

* Works on the "internal" as well as external evidences are studied, and therefore, is our author accurate in saying "those infallible, surprising testimonies to the Divinity of the Old and New Testaments, which constitute the living witness within them, and can be discovered only in themselves, are sealed up from their view."

† See pp. 5 and 70.

rian parent will chuse to commit his children to him, or *vice versa*, although he may hold in his hand no other book than the Bible, and sacredly avoid the use of every "polemical work."*

But the project we are considering is not only impracticable—it will not be adopted by the irreligious and the indifferent, and cannot be by the religious, in their schools generally—but the author seems fully aware of its impracticability. It is true his remarks on this point are not as prominent as perhaps they should have been, but though in a note, they are sufficiently explicit: "Those denominations which agree in essentials, can easily unite in a scheme of education, with the Bible as a daily text book." "It is neither unjust nor illiberal on the part of those who can thus harmonize, so to construct their schemes of education, as to attain the first great object, even though the effect should be to exclude from their schools, the children of those sects which cannot unite with them. Those who adopt the views of the Address, on the subject of religious education, and on the expediency and duty of making the Bible a daily text book, will feel that these are ends far too important to be sacrificed to the gratification of admitting into the same school, the children of every religious denomination. Assuredly they are as little bound to make this sacrifice, as to accomodate their worship to the views of others who disagree with them; for, according to my sentiments, the school is as much the appropriate place and season for the Christian instruction of the young, as the Church for the religious improvement of those of mature years. The minority have no reason to complain that the majority do what they conceive to be their duty by their own children, instead of disregarding that duty, by providing a scheme to embrace the children of both. Who can hesitate between the children of others and his own, even in temporal concerns? Still less should he pause, when the question is, whether the temporal good of those shall be preferred to the spiritual good of these."—(*Note to page 22.*)

We demur to the opinion that there are any two sects who can form the union here referred to, and have no doubt when the experiment is made, the result will be that each sect will institute its own school, which will of course admit all who wish to be. But the principle, viz. concurrence in religious opinion on the part of those who control

* We gladly fortify our opinion by that of a cotemporary journal, received since this was written. "An Episcopal instructor will, with all his efforts to generalize, teach views accordant with those of his Church. He cannot help it; for his religion has been implanted in his own mind—not as abstract theories—but as Episcopal religious truth; and in the communication of it to others, he cannot but impart it as it exists in his mind. The same is true as respects the Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Methodist, or the Friend. And until we shall have an institution founded to teach religion in a form abstracted from the views of all denominations, in which no part of the Episcopal, or Methodist, or Baptist, or Presbyterian, or Quaker system is introduced, or a class of teachers so richly endowed with the capacity of abstraction, as to be able to separate every item of peculiarity from the principles of gospel truth, and present it to the mind as a pure essence, we apprehend the difficulty and danger against which we warn the members of our Church, will continue to exist."—*Pro. Episcopalian and Church Register.*

the school, is here admitted in its fullest extent, and we repeat, without such concurrence the project in the Address cannot be accomplished. We think, therefore, with deference, that the labour, the talent and learning of the Address are lost, for it recommends what will not be attended to by some schools; what cannot consistently be done by many, and what is already done by the "Christian institutions" which are now rising in our country. In this magazine, within a short time, the prospectus of two schools, one in New-York, and another in Connecticut, has appeared, which especially contemplate the giving religious instruction. It is true, these and similar schools do not deem it necessary that the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible shall be used. Perhaps judicious selections from that incomparable book are preferred: and it may be those works, as best adapted to aid the memory, which set forth bible doctrines and precepts in a systematic order. Such a system, the judicious teacher will very naturally resort to, either making it himself, or availing himself of the treatises of others. But it is not very clear, that the Address intended to recommend the whole Bible as the best medium of instruction. It is evident at least that the author would use the New Testament chiefly, and would give prominence to the preceptive part of it, for he says, "if you require of every instructor to teach the *duties of life* from the Bible, I at least believe, you would have nothing to fear." He speaks of "the admirable common sense of the Sermon on the Mount—the practical simplicity and beauty, benevolence and holiness, that plead so eloquently in the life and death, in the character and sentiments of the Redeemer."

If it be so, that in the existing *Christian* schools, the Bible itself is postponed to human works on religion, we trust that the Address will lead to a deliberate reconsideration of the subject. We are inclined to the opinion that the holy book may be advantageously studied in such schools, from the primary to the highest, of course under the arrangement of a judicious teacher, who will know what parts only are adapted to the younger scholars. We cannot suppose for a moment that it is intended to recommend the Bible to the exclusion of all other religious books, so valuable for explaining and enforcing it.

We have seen that the recommendation before us is impracticable, as it respects the vast majority of schools; that it is unnecessary as it respects the few "Christian schools," (except so far as it relates to the Bible itself in preference to other religious books) since the union of secular and religious instruction is at the very foundation of these schools. We shall now take another view of the Address, and, assuming that the public were prepared to adopt the proposal, venture to question its expediency. If it be intended that the Bible should be adopted as a Class Book in every school now existing, and in every school which may be expected to exist as long as a majority of the community are in fact, if not in name, unchristian, we think the measure is liable to very serious objections. Here is a schoolmaster, or a professor, or a president of a College who

is an unbeliever in the Christian religion. The author admits there are teachers who not only think, but "have spoken and written disrespectfully of religion." Shall I place the Bible in his hands to be depreciated with words, (fair to the ear, but readily understood,) perhaps by a significant shrug, by those artful insinuations, which are the most powerful weapon of the Infidel? Impossible. The pious parent will not suffer his child to come within the atmosphere of such a man. He will justly be afraid of his incorporating irreligious remarks, even with those lessons which seem to afford no scope for profaning the sacred subject. How much less will he invite such a ~~man~~ to indulge ~~in~~ unhappy perversity of mind and heart by placing the Bible in his hands, and compelling him to use it as a Class Book.

Here is a man absorbed in the pursuits of the life that now is, who has never made religion the subject of reflection, who merely believes it as he does a hundred other things, without caring whether they are true or not. How reluctantly would such a man teach the Bible. How anxiously would he escape from the task, omit the lesson on every possible pretext, hurry it over when it could not be omitted, and by his whole manner compel the pupil to think that in the judgment of his master at least, which will have its influence, religion was quite a secondary concern. The effect of bible lessons from such a man, would be to lead his pupils to undervalue the Bible. Surely it is better that he should be confined to a department in which he is qualified to be useful, in which he feels an interest, as to the proficiency of his scholar, and that the parent himself, or the Sunday School teacher, or some other pious person should be their instructor in the Bible. But says the Address, "Is there a capable instructor, whose sentiments and conduct are not decidedly favourable to religion? At present, he receives employment; but change the plan, and you would never engage him, because he would have to teach from the Bible. Our seminaries have, at times, been dishonored by men, who have been addicted to intemperance and profane swearing, who have spoken and written disrespectfully of religion, who profane the Sabbath, and rarely, if ever, attend the worship of Christian assemblies. Such men could not be patronized under a scheme, embracing the daily study of the Bible." Undoubtedly this would be the result, if the trustees, or directors, or the majority of parents were religious men, but while the case is otherwise, most teachers will continue to be as they are, hostile or indifferent to religion, and into such hands we hope the Bible, with the understanding that *they* are to teach it, will not be placed.

As it respects the minority of instructors, those who are decidedly religious, there can be no objection, on the contrary it is desirable, that they should use the Bible as a Class Book. Of course the judicious parent will select from among them such as hold the religious views, which he believes to be scriptural. If the Address was intended to persuade such men to give religion a greater degree of attention, and to consider the claims of the Bible as a

Class Book, we have not a word to say against it. But, if a general change is the object proposed, for the reasons given, we would ask leave to record our dissent.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

Charleston, 17th of April, 1830.

Messrs. Editors,—The following extract will, I hope justify my freedom in addressing you, and will be a sufficient inducement for you to comply with my request.

"If ever you should be pressed with any of their (Roman Catholic) arguments which I have mentioned, and not perhaps remember the answer to it, still remember that you have seen it answered. Or if any other argument should be used to which you cannot of yourselves reply, consult those that can: tell us your difficulties in time; be assured such as would keep you from this do not mean honestly; give us but a fair hearing before you determine to leave us, and we doubt not your staying with us." (*Brief Confutation*, Part 2d, c. xiv.) I am by birth and education a Protestant. My opinions of the Roman Catholic religion were formed from the perusal of Protestant authors. From curiosity to know what arguments are adduced in support of the dogmas of that religion, I read a popular controversial work by a Roman Catholic bishop. I became deeply interested, and pursued the study of religious controversy to some extent. Doubts have arisen in my mind respecting the soundness of some of my former conclusions; I have determined to follow the advice of "Porteus," quoted above. I propose to state those doubts plainly and briefly; requesting a solution of them from yourselves, or from some of your readers.

First—Of the Rule of Faith.

- a. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," saith our Saviour to his disciples; b. "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."
- c. "All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you."
- d. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."
- e. "And they went forth and preached everywhere."

a. Matt. xxviii. 18. xi. 27. Luke, x. 22. John, iii. 35. xiii. 3. xvi. 15. 1 Cor. xv. 27. Phil. ii. 9-11. Col. i. 16-19. Heb. ii. 8. 1 Pet. iii. 22.

b. John, xx. 21. xiii. 20. xvii. 18. Matt. x. 40. Luke, x. 16. 2 Cor. v. 20. Gal. iv. 14.

c. John, xv. 15. xvii. 6-8. Matt. xiii. 11. Luke, x. 23, 34. Acts, xx. 27. 1 Cor. ii. 9-12. Eph. i. 9. iii. 5. Col. i. 26. 1 Peter, i. 11, 12.

d. Mark, xvi. 15. Matt. xxviii. 19. Luke, xxiv. 47. Acts, i. 8. xiii. 47.

e. Mark, xvi. 20. Acts, iii. 20. v. 42. viii. 5, 12, 35. ix. 20. x. 36, 42. xi. 20. xiii. 1-5, 38, 42, 44. xiv. 21. xvii. 3, 18. Rom. x. 18. 1 Cor. i. 23. xv. 1. 2 Cor. x. 14, 16. Gal. iv. 13. Eph. iii. 8. Col. i. 24-29. 1 Thess. i. 5-10. ii. 1-4.

We learn from these passages of Scripture the nature of the commission which the Apostles received: the power and authority with which they were invested; and their faithfulness in the discharge of the duty imposed upon them by that commission. From those which follow, we see how strongly they insisted upon their authority to teach, and upon the obligation of their hearers to learn, and obey or submit.

- f.* "We are of God, (saith St. John) he that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us: hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error."
- g.* "Remember them which have the rule over you, (saith St. Paul) who have spoken unto you the word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of your conversation.—Obey them that have rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls as they must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief, for that is unprofitable for you."

We have proof in the next place, that they were careful to provide a succession of faithful men in the ministry of the gospel.

- h.* "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."
- i.* "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood."
- k.* "I charge thee therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine."
- l.* Consider next what St. Paul says to the Romans—"For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed? *And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? AND HOW SHALL THEY HEAR WITHOUT A PREACHER?—SO THAT FAITH COMETH BY HEARING, AND HEARING BY THE WORD OF GOD.*"

From all these texts of Scripture, I conclude that the primitive rule of faith, was hearing the word preached by the Apostles and

f. 1 John, iv. 6. Matt. x. 14, 15, 40. xvii. 5. Mark, vi. 11. Luke, ix. 5, 48. x. 16, 22. John, viii. 19, 47. xiii. 20. xiv. 17. xviii. 37. Acts, iii. 22, 23. Heb. ii. 1-3. 1 Thess. iv. 8.

g. Heb. xiii. 7, 17. 1 Cor. iii. 9. iv. 1, 2, 16. xi. 1, 2. 2 Cor. v. 20, 21. vi. 1-7. Phil. iii. 17. 1 Thess. i. 6. v. 12, 13. 2 Thess. iii. 4, 7, 9.

h. 2 Tim. ii. 12, 14, 15, 24. iii. 10. i. 5, 6, 13, 14. Acts, xiv. 23. xx. 27, 28. 1 Cor. iv. 17. xvi. 10-12, 15, 16. Eph. iv. 11-16. Phil. ii. 19-30. 1 Thess. iii. 2-6. 1 Tim. i. 3, 8-11, 18, 19. iii. 1-5. iv. 6, 11-16. v. 17. vi. 2-5, 11-14. Tit. i. 5-9, 13, 14. ii. 1-8. iii. 8. 2 Pet. i. 15.

i. Acts, xx. 23. Col. iv. 17. 1 Pet. v. 1-3.

k. 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2.

l. Rom. x. 13-18. Matt. xiii. 8, 23. Luke, viii. 11-15, 21. xi. 28. Mark, iv. 8, 20. 1 Cor. i. 17, 18, 21-24. 1 Thess. ii. 13. 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. James, i. 18-21. 1 Pet. i. 23, 25. Tit. i. 3.

their companions; and that this rule was designed to remain in force after their death. "At the rise of the Christian religion, (says Lardner) there were no written systems or records of it. It was first taught and confirmed by Christ himself in his most glorious ministry: and was still further confirmed by his willing death, and his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension to heaven. *Afterwards it was taught by word of mouth, and propagated by the preaching of his Apostles and their companions.*"—(Watson's Theological Tracts, vol. ii. ch. iii. p. 19.)

Now I desire to be informed when and by whom was this rule abrogated or altered, and the private interpretation of Scripture substituted for it, or made equivalent to it. I wish to see historical facts, and not mere conjectures in reply.

A PROTESTANT IN DOUBT.

[The foregoing communication was not received in time to be inserted, or acknowledged in our last. The delay, however, enables us to accompany the publication of it with the following remarks, furnished us by another correspondent at our request, in reply to the inquiry made in it. For ourselves, we are too good Protestants to approve or practice works of supererogation, and we should deem it such to enter at this day *de novo* and at large on the Romanist controversy. The subject has been fully discussed and exhausted by abler hands; and we hold ourselves quit of our duty as defenders of the faith, in that particular, by opening to our readers from time to time, as occasion may require, the treasures which the labours of the saints have already provided for us.—*Editors.*]

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

Messrs. Editors,—If your correspondent, "A Protestant in doubt," had read two lines more in making his citation from Lardner, he would have found a very good reason given why the Christian religion was at the first "taught by word of mouth," and not by written documents. I will add those two lines, which immediately follow his citation: "*Nor was it fit, (says Lardner) that any books should be writ about it, till there were converts to receive and keep them, and deliver them to others.*" As soon as that was the case, the truths of salvation were secured from the manifold hazards of *oral tradition*, by being committed to the custody of the Churches, in the permanent and unvarying form of written instruments—dumb witnesses that cannot lie. I will here add another paragraph from Lardner, which stands a few lines below the foregoing. "As the Christians at Thessalonica had received the doctrine taught by St. Paul, *not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God*; 1 Thess. ii. 13.) they would receive his *epistles* as the *written word of God*. And himself taught them so to do, requiring that they should be solemnly *read unto all the holy brethren.* (1 Thess. v. 27.) He gives a like direction, but more extensive, at the end of his epistle to the *Colossians*, (iv. 16.) requiring them, after they had read it *amongst themselves, to cause it to be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans; and that they likewise read the epistle that would come to them from Laodicea.*" Now, I would ask your correspondent, whether St.

Paul could not express his meaning as exactly and as intelligibly by writing, as he could by speech; and whether the Thessalonians, and Colossians could not understand the things written by him, just as well as they could understand the same things spoken by him? If so, then St. Paul's epistles could be, and were, to them, and to all others, just as good a rule of faith, as St. Paul's preaching. And if not, I should like to know a reason why. This premised, I proceed to make a few further remarks.

1. The rule of the Christian faith, previously to the written Scriptures of the New Testament, it is admitted, was the teaching of our Lord, and his chosen Apostles. They were divinely commissioned for this office, and were inspired with all truth. Their teaching therefore, was infallibly true.

2. But this rule did not then exclude the Scriptures so far as they were written, viz. the books of the Old Testament. For these were then, both to Jews and Gentiles the word of life, and the word of salvation. (2 Tim. iii. 14-17.) "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and, that from a child, thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, *which are able to make thee wise unto salvation*, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; *that the man of God may be perfect*, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." I hardly need add that these "Holy Scriptures" spoken of here, were the books of the Old Testament.

3. When St. Paul preached to the Bereans, they tried his doctrine by the rule of the Scripture, "and searched the Scriptures daily *whether those things were so*. Therefore many of them believed." (Acts, xvii. 11.) Our Lord himself appealed to the *Scriptures*, not to the living teachers, the doctors of the Jewish Church, for proof of his divine mission, and as being *sufficient* to testify of him.—(See John, v. 39, 46, 47. and Luke, xvi. 31.) Nay, he justly reproached the Jewish doctors that they had made void the law of God through their traditions. (See Matt. xv. 3, 6, 9.)

Now the rule of faith of the Jewish Church was, either their Scriptures—or their living teachers and doctors of the law: if the former, then a written rule served them, and so may serve us:—if the latter, then they were justified in rejecting and crucifying their king, according to the decision of their spiritual guides.

4. The Apostles and Evangelists committed to writing the truths they taught, expressly for the use and instruction of the Church, as well during their life time, as after their decease.^(a)—See Luke i. 3, 4. and 2 Pet. i. 12-15.

(a) "Quicquid enim ille (Christus) de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis (Apostolis) tanquam suis manibus imperavit."—August. de Consens. Evang. lib. i. c. 35.

"Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis cognovimus quam per quos Euangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc preconiauerunt, postea vero, per Dei voluntatem, in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum."—Irenæus, lib. iii. c. 1.

5. They declare that the truths so committed to writing by them, are sufficient for the salvation of men.^(b)—See *John*, xx. 31, 31. and *1 John*, i. 3, 4, and *1 John*, v. 13.

6. One main purpose which the providence of God designed in their writing, was to give to the truths of salvation that character of perpetuity and immutability which writing only can impart; to guard the Church in all ages against the false and pernicious doctrines, which the spirit foresaw and foretold would be brought in by false teachers in after times; to furnish a *standard of verity* by which to test the pretensions of those teachers, and to detect and refute the innovations and adulterations with which they might corrupt the purity of the gospel; in fine, to be to the Church a preservative against the variable, false, mutilated, and uncertain accounts which might be handed down by *vivâ voce* tradition, or forged to serve the private views of ambitious teachers—a preservative equally against the infirmity of human memory, and the arts of designing fraud.—See *Matt.* viii. 15, 16. xxiv. 4, 24. *Acts*, xx. 29, 30. *2 Pet.* ii. 1–3. also *Gal.* i. 17, 18. *1 John*, iv. 1. *2 John*, x. 11. *Col.* ii. 8, 18, 23. *1 Tim.* iv. 1–4. *1 Thess.* v. 21. *Isaiah*, viii. 19, 20.

7. Adopting then, as we do, the written Scriptures, as designed by the providence of God, to be the sole rule of our faith, and not the fallible teaching of uninspired men, we find in them the assurance that *true Christians* are assisted by the Holy Spirit to discern the truth, in all things necessary to salvation.

John, v. 45. It is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.

John, vii. 17. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.

1 John, ii. 20, 26, 27. But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.—These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you.—But the anointing which ye have received of him, abideth in you; and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.

It is in vain, therefore, to pretend that the Scriptures cannot be understood without the aid of an infallible Church to interpret them. There is none such on earth; nor do we need such. The Holy Ghost, the author of Scripture, made it sufficiently plain in all things necessary; and is still an infallible guide in such things to all who faithfully seek his direction. Such is the testimony of Scripture; and if we need it, such is the testimony of the primitive Church.^(c)

(b) "Cum multa fecisset Dominus Jesus, non omnia Scripta sunt, electa sunt autem quæ scriberentur, quæ salutis credentium sufficere risa sunt."—*August. Tract. in Joan.* 49.

"Non igitur omnia, quæ Dominus fecit, conscripta sunt, sed quæ scribentes tam ad mores, quam ad dogma putarunt sufficere."—*Cyrill. in Joan.* lib. xliii.

(c) In his, quæ aperte posita sunt in Scriptura, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem, moresque vivendi, spem scilicet et charitatem."—*August. de Doctrin. Christian.* lib. ii. c. 9.

Indeed, it is ridiculous to pretend, as the Romanists do, that their supposed infallible Church can teach more plainly in her decrees, than the Holy Ghost does, or can, in the Scriptures. I will only add further, a short demonstration of the point in the words of a master. Knott, the Jesuit, in his controversy with Dr. Potter, had said, "We acknowledge Holy Scripture to be a most perfect rule, forasmuch as a writing can be a rule; we only deny that it excludes either divine tradition, though it be unwritten, or an external judge to keep, to propose, to interpret it in a true, orthodox, and catholic sense."^(d)

Chillingworth replies as follows:^(e) "If you will stand to what you have granted, that Scripture is as perfect a rule of faith as a writing can be; you must then grant it both so complete that it needs no addition, and so evident that it needs no interpretation; for both these properties are requisite to a perfect rule, and a writing is capable of both these qualities.

"That both these properties are requisite to a perfect rule, it is apparent; because that is not perfect in any kind which wants some parts belonging to its integrity; as he is not a perfect man that wants any part appertaining to the integrity of a man; and therefore, that which wants any accession to make it a perfect rule, of itself is not a perfect rule. And then, the end of a rule is to regulate and direct. Now every instrument is more or less perfect in its kind, as it is more or less fit to attain the end for which it is ordained; but nothing obscure or unevident, while it is so, is fit to regulate and direct them to whom it is so; therefore it is requisite also to a rule, (so far as it is a rule) to be evident; otherwise, indeed, it is no rule, because it cannot serve for direction. I conclude, therefore, that both these properties are requisite to a perfect rule: both to be so complete as to need no addition; and to be so evident as to need no interpretation.

"Now that a writing is capable of both these perfections, it is so plain, that I am even ashamed to prove it. For he that denies it, must say, that something may be spoken which cannot be written. For if such a complete and evident rule of faith may be delivered by word of mouth, as you pretend it may, and is; and whatsoever is delivered by word of mouth, may also be written; then such a complete and evident rule of faith may also be written. If you will have more light added to the sun, answer me then to these questions:

"*Sancta enim Scriptura nostra doctrinæ regulam figit, ne audeamus sapere plus quam oportet.*"—*De bono Viduitat.* c. 1

"*Sufficiunt sancta et divinitus inspiratæ Scripturæ ad omnem instructionem veritas.*"—*Athanas. contra. Gentes.*

"*Omnia clara sunt ac plana ex Scripturis divinis; quæcunque necessaria sunt, manifesta sunt.*"—*Chrysost. ii. Thessal. 2.*

"*Spiritus sancti doctrina est, quæ canonicis literis prodita est; contra quam si quid statuunt concilia, nefas duco.*"—*Hieron. ad Galat.*

"The early Christian writers declare the inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the rule of faith. And in that doctrine they concur and consent."—*Lardner's Credibil. of the Gosp. H. b. i. c. 36.*

(d) *Charity maintained*, ch. ii. § 1. in *Chillingw. Works*, vol. i. p. 162. 8vo. 1820.

(e) *Chap. ii. pp. 202, 203.*

Whether your Church can set down all these which she pretends to be divine, unwritten traditions, and add them to the verities already written? And, whether she can set us down such interpretations of all obscurities in the faith, as shall need no farther interpretations? If she cannot, then she hath not that power which you pretend she hath, of being an infallible teacher of all divine verities, and an infallible interpreter of obscurities in the faith; for she cannot teach us all divine verities, if she cannot write them down; neither is that an interpretation which needs again to be interpreted. If she can, let her do it; and then we shall have a writing, not only capable of, but actually endowed with both these perfections, of being so complete as to need no addition, and so evident as to need no interpretation. Lastly, whatsoever your Church can do, or not do, no man can, without blasphemy, deny that Christ Jesus, if he had pleased, could have writ us a rule of faith so plain and perfect, as that it should have wanted neither any part to make up its integrity, nor any clearness to make it sufficiently intelligible. And if Christ could have done this, then the thing might have been done; a writing there might have been, endowed with both these properties. Thus, therefore, I conclude; a writing may be so perfect a rule, as to need neither addition nor interpretation; but the Scripture you acknowledge a perfect rule, forasmuch as a writing can be a rule, therefore it needs neither addition nor interpretation."

I will not, and I think need not, pursue the subject further, having already occupied more space than I designed; but take my leave of your correspondent with the friendly counsel, that if he should still remain "in doubt," upon the present point, or any other of the Romanist controversy, he will be likely to find full satisfaction in Chillingworth's "*Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation*," where he may see both sides handled by able writers, and learn how to detect sophistry, and vindicate truth.

CATHOLICUS.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

ON THE SACRED MINISTRY.

"A minister must be very mean spirited if he regards his salary as alms or benefactions from his people. What they give, they more than have returned in services; and "the labourer is worthy his hire." Has not God ordained, that they who preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel? And is not this law founded in equity and justice? Would not the same talents the man devotes to the service of the sanctuary, provide for himself and his family, if employed in secular concerns? Let Congregations look at this attentively; and especially those individuals in them who pay more annually for the most menial of their attendants, than to the shepherd of their souls; while others, with all their commendation, never confer upon him one token of respect in their lives.

"Let him" says the Apostle "be without fear." And again: "Know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and esteem them very highly in love for their work's

sake." He means not only in reward of their work, but in aid of it; for unless you magnify his office, you are not likely to be impressed by it; and as your regard for the preacher declines, [so will you profit by him. Your relation to him is such, that if he is degraded, you are disgraced in him; and if he is honoured, you share in his respectability. Ministers are men; and the best of men are but men at the best. You are not required to approve of their infirmities, or even to be ignorant of them; but surely you will not be suspicious; you will not invite or welcome reflection and insinuation; nor, like too many, speak of him or suffer him to be spoken of, before children and servants and strangers, with a levity and freedom, far from being adapted to increase or preserve esteem and respect. You will consider his character not only as forming his crown, but as essential to his acceptance and success. "Receive, therefore, in the Lord with all gladness: and hold such in reputation."

POETRY.

The admirers of the lines entitled "Home, Sweet Home," will be pleased with the following Hymn, from the Repertory.

HYMN.

O where can the soul find relief from its
foes?

A shelter of safety, a home of repose?
Can earth's highest summit or deepest
hid vale,

Give a refuge no sorrow nor sin can
assail?

No, no—there's no home—
There's no home on earth—the soul has
no home.

Shall it leave the low earth, and soar to
the sky,

And seek for a home in the mansions
on high?

In the bright realms of bliss will a dwell-
ing be giv'n,

And the soul find a home in the glory
in Heav'n?

Yes, yes—there's a home—
There's a home in high Heaven—the
soul has a home.

O holy and sweet, its rest shall be there,
Free forever from sin, and sorrow, and
care!

And the loud hallelujah's of Angels shall
rise,

To welcome the soul to its home in
the skies.

Home, home—home of the soul!
The bosom of God is the home of the
soul.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Pinckney Lecture.—The same was delivered in St. Philip's Church, Charleston, on the day specified in the will of the honourable founder, viz. the Wednesday after the second Tuesday in May, (12th). The appointed Lecturer having been sick when the November lecture was delivered; the Rector of the above Church officiated as lecturer on both occasions.

Columbia, South-Carolina.—The Rev. T. S. W. Mott, late Rector of Christ Church, on St. Simon's Island, has been unanimously invited to the rectorate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in this city, and we understand, has accepted the invitation.

Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church.—On Tuesday the 11th May, the anniversary meeting of the Board of Directors, was held at Philadelphia:—The report of the Executive Committee was read, also the report of Bishop Brownell, “containing a brief account of his journey, and some most affecting summaries and estimates relative to the spiritual destitution of the West and South.” According to the Treasurer’s report, the total amount of receipts last year was \$10,827 52, of which \$2700 are for the Greek mission, and \$1500 for Churches in Florida. Not less than \$2000 will be wanted for completing the buildings at Green Bay, a station convenient for instructing the Indians. In the domestic department, there is a deficiency of about \$1000. The anniversary sermon, which is spoken of in high terms, was delivered at St. Andrew’s, by the Rev. Mr. Doane, of Trinity Church, Boston. Owing to inclement weather, the collection was only \$50. The Rev. Mr. Robertson, the Missionary appointed for Greece, has, in a late tour through Virginia and Maryland, collected for that mission above \$1500. From his report in the Missionary paper No. we 6, extract as follows:

“It is highly probable that a Greek ecclesiastical council will be summoned, at no very distant period, for the regulation, and, to some extent, the reformation of the Church. Many persons are of opinion, that the Church in Greece will then assume an independent stand as a distinct national establishment; and that, like the Church of Russia, while it remains united in communion of doctrine and worship with the patriarch of Constantinople, it will be governed by its own laws, and be subjected to the jurisdiction of spiritual rulers who acknowledge no foreign superior. Two bishops, and other individuals, both lay and clerical, have stated to me, that there is a growing inclination to form some bond of union, or mode of friendly intercourse, between the Greek and other Christian Churches. They say that they cherish little hope that any thing can be done in regard to the Church of Rome, but that they are more sanguine as to other denominations of Christians. To effect this end, they are of opinion that delegates from other ecclesiastical bodies will be invited to attend the anticipated council, to compare views and concert measures. In the event of such an invitation, how desirable is it that we should have men on the spot, daily securing that intimate knowledge of the language of the country, the peculiarities of the Church, and the character of the Clergy, which may render them well-qualified representatives of their own denomination!” * * * * *

“The exertions of a Missionary in Greece, though chiefly directed to its own depressed but rising people, would not probably be wholly confined to them. He would often be enabled to exercise beneficial influence over foreigners from various regions. Even in my own short tour I found such opportunities, and I have reason to bless God for the favour which he gave me in the eyes of many with whom I met.” * * *

“But it is especially upon Mahometans that this influence will be most interesting and important. In Turkey itself any very direct efforts to change the faith of a follower of the prophet, would prove perilous both to the Christian teacher and to the individual who should

seriously listen to him. But there will be no barrier to the freest intercourse in Greece. In a short period many Turks will be found visiting the sea-ports and islands of Greece for purposes of commerce, and we shall often be able to engage in conversation with them, and turn their attention to the Scriptures." * * *

The following letter from Greek Ecclesiastics, was addressed to Bishop White, and our other Bishops:—

"Though the Greeks, through the past Ottoman tyranny, have degenerated from the sentiments of their sires, and have almost sunk into a hateful barbarism, the Hellenic blood has, nevertheless, not ceased to circulate in their veins; so that even while wearing the yoke, they have aimed at the ancient glory, and the ecclesiastical and religious rights of their ancestors. As soon, moreover, as they embarked in a contest for these very blessings, they witnessed also, the philanthropic bowels of America, sympathising with them, and evincing a benevolent and Christian feeling, by the transmission of supplies for their corporeal wants, such as food, clothing, and other contributions, together with consolatory letters of Christian charity.

"But our spiritual joy and gladness, most reverend sirs, became unbounded, from the moment that your ecclesiastical and pious letter, by the hands of the Rev. John Jacob Robertson, was exhibited to our eyes; by which, assured of the sentiments which you entertain towards our apostolic Church, we exclaim—Would that now might be fulfilled the declaration of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ—'And my Gospel shall be preached to every creature, and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.'

"We have confidence in the Lord our Saviour, that he will enlighten his people with the knowledge of the truth, that his holy name may be glorified with one accordant voice of worship for ever and ever; and we remain respectfully,

"GEORGE KAZES, Priest and Oeconomus,
ATHANASIUS, Priest and Protopapas,
NICHOLAS GABRIEL, Priest,
ANDREW, Priest and Nomophylax,

} *The Priesthood of
Dimitsana.*

"*Dimitsana, July 8th, 1829.*"

Georgia.—The Eighth Annual Convention was held on the 19th April, at Savannah—Present 3 Clergymen and 4 Laymen. The Rev. T. S. W. Mott, was elected President, and E. F. Campbell, Esq. Secretary.

The Rector of St. Paul's, Augusta, reported that the Female Missionary Society of that Parish, by a spirited effect, had raised \$1200. The Rector of Christ Church, Savannah, reported, that at a fair for Missionary purposes, \$634, 88, had been obtained. The Treasurer of the Society for the General Advancement of Christianity in Georgia, reported in the Treasury \$125,90. The Sermon was preached on the 18th (being Sunday) by the Rev. E. Neufville, and a vote of thanks, with a request that it should be printed, passed.

Barbadoes.—St. Mark's Chapel, in the Parish of St. John, was recently Consecrated, being the second since the Bishop's arrival in

this diocese. Two others are nearly finished, and the ground for three more offered. St. Mark's was erected in ten weeks from the day on which the first stone was laid, on part of the lands of the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign parts."—*Codrington College* was visited by the Bishop, after the ceremony of Consecration, accompanied by the Governor of the Island.

Candidates for Holy Orders.—A correspondent of the *Christian Journal* says, "Let the crying demand for aid to youths and young men who have piety, zeal, devotion, natural talent, eagerness to give themselves to the ministry, every qualification but *means of living while pursuing their studies*, be answered, and answered promptly, and answered liberally. Such youths and young men are daily increasing around us. At this moment, within the knowledge of of your present correspondent, several of the most promising character are burning with the very fervent desire that they have to devote themselves to the preparation for the ministry; *but they cannot, because they must labour for their support*. If any of your benevolent and Christian-minded readers would send contributions to this great and good object to the office of your *Journal*, I can answer them, Messrs. Editors, that they could be immediately and most efficiently applied.

"The Convention of New-York passed a resolution in 1828, and a canon in 1829, whereby the diocese is pledged for active and vigorous operations in the vitally important matter of aiding young men in preparation for the ministry. Most devoutly is it to be hoped that the benefits of these conventional acts will be soon and largely realized."

The Prayer Book.—Whenever a person will take the trouble to examine the Prayer Book, and whenever he will regularly and carefully use it in every part of our public worship, joining in the responses, and audibly uttering all those parts appropriated to the people, he will seldom, if ever, fail to become fond of it, and finally to adhere to it. In illustration of this, I cannot help relating a circumstance which a lady of great respectability in the city of New-York, related in my hearing many years ago. She was educated in our Church, was strongly attached to it, and had been a Communicant for several years, when she married a gentleman of great worth and piety, but of another denomination, and having considerable prejudice against our communion. Nothing was said as to religious attachments until after marriage, each concluding that the other would act conscientiously, and this it was believed, would prove satisfactory, and conduce to domestic happiness. The Sunday after the wedding, the gentleman proposed that they should, in the morning, attend the Church of his bride, and in the afternoon go to his own. This was cheerfully agreed to, and the following week found them quietly settled in their own habitation. At the breakfast table, the next Sunday morning, the question came up—to what Church shall we go? After a little good natured conversation, the lady made the following proposition to her husband—"You admit," said she, "that the Church to which I belong is a pure and primitive branch of the Protestant Communion, and you say, it is a matter of little consequence to which denomination we belong; now, you may think me bigoted if you will, but I cannot help believing that as it relates to an unquestionably apostolical ministry, and the benefit of a prescribed mode of worship, the Church of my attachment has superior advantages, though I am ready to confess that very many of our people do not improve them, and I am also sensible that your Communion, as well as others, embraces many excellent examples of piety. Upon your principles, therefore, there will be no great sacrifice to you, if you attend my Church altogether,

provided it shall appear to you that you can enjoy in her services suitable means for the advancement of your holiness of heart and life. I propose, then, you shall go with me one year steadily to my Church, providing yourself with a Prayer Book, and using it regularly as I do in all parts of the service; and if at the end of the year, you shall say that you are not satisfied, that you do not find your pious affections strengthened and encouraged, and that you prefer going back to your Communion, I will consent to go with you, and attend your Church while we live together." The gentleman pronounced this a very liberal proposal, took his Prayer Book, and devoutly used it by the side of his wife. Before the year expired, he declared his perfect admiration of its excellencies, and to the day of his death, was as constant as he was ardent in the employment of it.—*Auburn Gos. Mess.*

BIBLE QUESTIONS.

The members of the Bible Class regret they were prevented answering the question proposed for the last month, but request that the same may be repeated for the ensuing month.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Sermon preached before the Convention of Georgia, April, 1830, by the Rev. E. Neufville.—The author has been happy in the selection of his text, (Judges, c. v. 15-23.) It affords a large scope for reflection, and cannot fail to remind us of certain events in the history of our Church, which all its friends cannot but wish had been otherwise. The conclusion is appropriate and animated, "We are assembled, once more, to mourn over the desolations of Zion and to concert plans for her enlargement. Thanks be to God, we still maintain our ground; and as yet, though few in number, have lost nothing in the contest. Our hands have been strengthened by our brethren, and their hearts are with us in our deliberations. But still we rejoice with trembling; we can boast no new victories, the earnest of our future exultation; no new monuments of the power and grace of Christ. The wilderness is solitary and cheerless yet; the claims of multitudes on the liberality of their more highly favoured brethren are still unsatisfied; they look to us for support; they need our efforts in their behalf: and if it be beyond our ability now to send them spiritual guides; if we cannot find those who are willing to go up to their relief; be ours at least the satisfaction of having done what we could; the determination to persevere in exertion, to strive together in prayer to the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his vineyard. He is faithful who has promised, 'thy work shall be rewarded; thine expectation shall not be cut off; whatsoever you shall ask, believing, ye shall receive.'"

This Note, will, we trust, command the attention it merits. Undoubtedly there is a carefulness as to this matter on the part of the Clergy which strangely contrasts with that of other men, more particularly of the physicians, who almost crowd our sickly regions. "The misapprehensions which prevail respecting the unhealthiness of the Southern States, have probably deterred many of our brethren of the Clergy from settling among us. But men of business have not been influenced, by any such consideration, to abandon the gains of commercial enterprize. And why should the herald of the cross forego a prospect of usefulness, because of apprehensions which, to say the least, are far from being well founded? For we deny that our climate is so fatal, as it is generally represented to be; or that there is as great a degree of mortality, in proportion to our number, as there is in sections of country which have the reputation of being far more salubrious. There is moreover, much wisdom in the saying: 'The path of duty is the path of safety.'"

Children's Magazine.—This useful and very interesting publication is continued. "By those (remarks the Episcopal Watchman) who are qualified to judge, this little work has been pronounced invaluable—of this character do I consider it to be; and I hesitate not to say that it should be found in every Episcopal family, especially where there are children. It is impossible to contemplate the benefits which it is calculated to produce in forming the future character of our Church, without feeling an increased degree in its favour. It is peculiarly adapted to the capacities and understandings of Children, and in every way calculated to create in them a taste

* In page 69 of No. III, Vol. ii, it is stated, "that the Locust does not grow in this country." We are sorry to have our diocese excluded from "this country." The locust grows abundantly in South Carolina, and no doubt many of our Sunday School Children have often tasted of the fruit, which is accurately represented in the picture, p. 67.—*Ed. Gos. Mess.*

for reading, and to teach them religious knowledge; and when it is considered that the price is but twenty-five cents a year, nothing ought, I conceive, to prevent its general circulation among us, both in and out of Sunday Schools. In truth, the price is not at all to be compared with its usefulness; and it will at once be perceived that it could not be afforded at this *low price*, but for the existence of our General Sunday School Union. It has already a large circulation in Sunday Schools, the number of copies issued, (it is understood) being between five and six thousand. This number, however, is not as large as it should be."

Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, part first.—"This work, which has so long been anxiously expected by our Sunday School Teachers, has at length made its appearance; and from an examination of its pages, we are constrained to believe it will more than realize the most sanguine expectations that may have been entertained concerning it. It is understood to have been prepared by the active and zealous Editor of the Union's periodicals, (the late Secretary,) whose former unintermitted labours in the cause of Sunday Schools instruction have drawn from all quarters the highest commendation.

"Each lesson is divided into *three parts*: 1. *QUESTIONS* on the portion of Scripture, (Epistle or Gospel, as it may be.) 2. *EXPLANATIONS* of difficult words and phrases. 3. *PRACTICAL and DOCTRINAL INFERENCES*. Thus, for example, on the Epistle for the first Sunday in advent, (Rom. xiii. 8-14.) the *first question* is, What must we not do? The *answer* derived from the Epistle is, Owe no man any thing. Corresponding to this, the *first inference* is, 'It is sinful to get in debt more than we are able to pay.' The *third question* is, 'What hath he that loveth another done?' Answering to this is an *explanation* of the phrase, 'He that loveth another,' i. e. with the sort of love which our Saviour has commanded those who believe in him to have toward all men; and the *inference* is, 'We cannot obey God unless we love one another.' So in the Gospel for the same day, *Question third*, Whither were they come? *Explanation*; Beth-pa-ge, (or Beth-phage,) a small village about three miles East of Jerusalem. *Question ninth*, What did he say they should find? (Answer from Epistle, An ass tied, &c.) *Inference*: Our Saviour knew all things; he could not see the ass and her foal, yet he knew they were there.

"These few examples casually selected have been given, in order that our readers may have an idea of the plan of the work. We trust it will ere long find its way into all our schools, as it will prove a most valuable assistant to Teachers, in their endeavours to explain to their scholars the Sacred Oracles. It has been frequently objected to our Union, that while other books of instruction in abundance have issued from its press, still there was none, the professed object of which was to facilitate a knowledge of the Scriptures. By this publication, (which is but the first of a series,) this objection is in a measure removed. From the advertisement we learn: 'This work has not been stereotyped. The Executive Committee esteeming it of too much importance, to admit of a mode of publication which would preclude any considerable alteration. They submit the following portion, as a specimen of what in their view the whole should be, and solicit the opinions of their fellow Churchmen. Suggestions of alterations or amendments, (in the form or matter,) from the Clergy and others, are respectfully requested, and will be thankfully received by the Secretary, if forwarded either by mail (post paid,) or through the medium of any of the depositories of the Union.'"

Essay on Ordination, by J. E. Cook, M. D.—In our numbers for January and February, this work was noticed, the following remarks, however, from the Church Register, will not be supernumerary. "Doctor Cook had been long and advantageously known as a distinguished and profoundly read member of the medical profession to which he had rendered the most valuable services by his writings; which are characterized by the same accuracy of deduction, the same patient and elaborate research, and by the same extensive and competent information, which are so conspicuously indicated by the present work. He had, moreover, for eighteen years, been an honoured, and most influential member of another religious society, in whose concerns he had taken a leading part, and to whose interests he had devoted his powers. The very fact of such a man, under such circumstances, undergoing so important a change in his views of the Christian ministry, speaks powerfully in favour of the ground upon which his newly acquired opinions rest—for, it must be granted, that nothing but the force of truth, nothing but the irresistible strength of the arguments by which Episcopacy is vindicated, could operate so fundamental

a change in such a mind. This fact must have its impression, even upon those who are still unconvinced by the same arguments. It must suggest to them that there is something in those arguments that claims for them a patient and unprejudiced examination—something that calls upon them to weigh well the grounds upon which they rest their own views; and, abandoning those guides by which they may have been misled, to investigate for themselves, and under a sense of personal responsibility, the claims which are advanced for the Episcopal constitution of the ministry. For we do think that much of the delusion upon this subject has been caused by too implicit a reliance upon some few influential and leading men, whose writings have been appealed to as ofacular authority, by those who have wanted either the impartiality requisite to a proper estimate of their reasonings, or the knowledge necessary to the detection of their numerous mis-statements and perversions in regard to the authorities relied upon. That there have been such abuses, no one, at all acquainted with the controversy, especially as it has been conducted in this country, can for a moment doubt. Nor can any one who will conscientiously read Doctor Cook's book, deny, that he has most completely exposed the misquotations and garblings of one of the favourite champions of Presbytery—so much so, that the very authorities adduced by him to invalidate Episcopacy, may be safely and confidently appealed to in its vindication. Of the truth of this, proofs rise on proofs. Perhaps there never was a case in which the ground was more completely removed from the feet of an adversary, than in this masterly work. And here, we ask no one to receive our assertions as proof upon this point, but refer, with confidence, to the work itself—from the candid perusal of which, every one, we should think, would rise, at once, with astonishment, at the extent to which sophistication and delusion have been carried upon this question, and with the conclusion that a cause which requires such a defence, must be unsound and untenable."

*Protestant Episcopal Society for the Advancement of Christianity
in South-Carolina.*

The Treasurer reports—

One Life Subscriber, Mrs. Sarah D. Grimké, \$50.

Two Annual Subscribers, Rev. P. Trapier, Dr. Theodore Gourdine.

EPISCOPAL ACTS.

ORDINATIONS.

By the Right Rev. Dr. Bowen, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South-Carolina; exercising Episcopal functions in Georgia, in conformity with the 20th Canon. On Sunday, April 25, 1830, in Christ Church, Savannah, Mr. Theodore B. Bartow, was admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons.

By the Right Rev. Dr. Moore, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia. On Sunday, April 11, 1830, in the Monumental Church in Richmond, Mr. Leonidas Polk, was admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons.

CONSECRATIONS.

By the Right Rev. Dr. Brownell, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Connecticut. On Thursday April 22, 1830, St. Paul's Church, New-Haven; and on Thursday May 6, 1830, Christ Church, in Pomfret, Con. were severally consecrated to the Christian Worship of Almighty God.

CALENDAR FOR JUNE.

1. *Whitsun Tuesday*—Anniversary of the Episcopal Female Bible, Prayer Book and Tract Society—meeting at Stephen's Chapel at 12 o'clock. *M.*
Anniversary Meeting of the Charleston Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Society—Sermon at St. Philip's Church, by the Rev. Dr. Adams, at 4 o'clock. *P. M.*
3. Meeting of the Board of the Managers of Pro. Epis. Sunday School Society.
5. Lecture to Children of the Sunday School, at the usual place.
6. *Trinity Sunday.*
7. Monthly Meeting of the Trustees of the Protestant Episcopal Society for the Advancement of Christianity in South-Carolina.
11. *St. Barnabas.*
13. *First Sunday after Trinity.*
20. *Second Sunday after Trinity.*
24. *Nativity of John Baptist.*
27. *Third Sunday after Trinity.*
29. *St. Peter.*